

# Water Compliance Inspection Report

## Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

[illegible]

## Section B: Facility Data

Name and Location of Facility Inspected (For industrial users discharging to POTW, also include POTW name and NPDES permit number) <u>Jerome Cheese Company</u> <u>47 West 100 South</u> <u>Jerome, ID 83338</u>	Entry Time/Date <u>8:50 AM / 04/02/09</u>	Permit Effective Date
Name(s) of On-Site Representative(s)/Title(s)/Phone and Fax Number(s) <u>William (Bill) Riebasell, Plant Manager, (208) 324-8806</u> <u>Dave Moore, Production Supervisor, (208) 324-8806</u>	Exit Time/Date <u>1:30 PM / 04/02/09</u>	Permit Expiration Date
Name, Address of Responsible Official/Title/Phone and Fax Number <u>Same as above.</u>	Other Facility Data (e.g., SIC NAICS, and other descriptive information) <u>SIC = 2022</u>	
Name, Address of Responsible Official/Title/Phone and Fax Number <u>Same as above.</u>	<div style="border: 2px solid blue; padding: 10px; text-align: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid blue; padding: 5px; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">RECEIVED</div> <div style="border: 1px solid blue; padding: 5px; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em; color: red;">MAY 18 2009</div> </div>	

## Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection (Check only those areas evaluated)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Permit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Self-Monitoring Program	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pretreatment	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> MS4 U.S. EPA REGION 10  OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT </div>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Records/Reports</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Compliance Schedules	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pollution Prevention	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Facility Site Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	Laboratory	<input type="checkbox"/>	Storm Water	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effluent/Receiving Waters	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Operations & Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	Combined Sewer Overflow	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Flow Measurement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sludge Handling/Disposal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sanitary Sewer Overflow	

## Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

(Attach additional sheets of narrative and checklists, including Single Event Violation codes, as necessary)

SEV Codes	SEV Description
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	_____
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	_____
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	_____
● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	_____

See the attached report.

Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s)	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers	Date
Joseph S. Roberto <i>[Signature]</i>	EPA/OCE/206-553-1669	05/18/09
Dustin Bott	EPA/OCE/206-553-5502	
Signature of Management Q A Reviewer	Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers	Date

ICIS.  
5-18-2009  
JJBron



# INSTRUCTIONS

## Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

**Column 1: Transaction Code.** Use N, C, or D for New, Change, or Delete. All inspections will be *new* unless there is an error in the data entered.

**Columns 3-11: NPDES Permit No.** Enter the facility's NPDES permit number - third character in permit number indicates permit type for U=unpermitted, G=general permit, etc.. (Use the Remarks columns to record the State permit number, if necessary.)

**Columns 12-17: Inspection Date.** Insert the date entry was made into the facility. Use the year/month/day format (e.g., 04/10/01 = October 01, 2004).

**Column 18: Inspection Type\*.** Use one of the codes listed below to describe the type of inspection:

A	Performance Audit	U	IU Inspection with Pretreatment Audit	!	Pretreatment Compliance (Oversight)
B	Compliance Biomonitoring	X	Toxics Inspection	@	Follow-up (enforcement)
C	Compliance Evaluation (non-sampling)	Z	Sludge - Biosolids	{	Storm Water-Construction-Sampling
D	Diagnostic	#	Combined Sewer Overflow-Sampling	}	Storm Water-Construction-Non-Sampling
F	Pretreatment (Follow-up)	\$	Combined Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling	:	Storm Water-Non-Construction-Sampling
G	Pretreatment (Audit)	+	Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Sampling	~	Storm Water-Non-Construction-Non-Sampling
I	Industrial User (IU) Inspection	&	Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling	<	Storm Water-MS4-Sampling
J	Complaints	\	CAFO-Sampling	-	Storm Water-MS4-Non-Sampling
M	Multimedia	=	CAFO-Non-Sampling	>	Storm Water-MS4-Audit
N	Spill	2	IU Sampling Inspection		
O	Compliance Evaluation (Oversight)	3	IU Non-Sampling Inspection		
P	Pretreatment Compliance Inspection	4	IU Toxics Inspection		
R	Reconnaissance	5	IU Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment		
S	Compliance Sampling	6	IU Non-Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment		
		7	IU Toxics with Pretreatment		

**Column 19: Inspector Code.** Use one of the codes listed below to describe the lead agency in the inspection.

A	State (Contractor)	O	Other Inspectors, Federal/EPA (Specify in Remarks columns)
B	EPA (Contractor)	P	Other Inspectors, State (Specify in Remarks columns)
E	Corps of Engineers	R	EPA Regional Inspector
J	Joint EPA/State Inspectors—EPA Lead	S	State Inspector
L	Local Health Department (State)	T	Joint State/EPA Inspectors—State lead
N	NEIC Inspectors		

**Column 20: Facility Type.** Use one of the codes below to describe the facility.

- 1 — Municipal. Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) with 1987 Standard Industrial Code (SIC) 4952.
- 2 — Industrial. Other than municipal, agricultural, and Federal facilities.
- 3 — Agricultural. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 0111 to 0971.
- 4 — Federal. Facilities identified as Federal by the EPA Regional Office.
- 5 — Oil & Gas. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 1311 to 1389.

**Columns 21-66: Remarks.** These columns are reserved for remarks at the discretion of the Region.

**Columns 67-69: Inspection Work Days.** Estimate the total work effort (to the nearest 0.1 work day), up to 99.9 days, that were used to complete the inspection and submit a QA reviewed report of findings. This estimate includes the accumulative effort of all participating inspectors; any effort for laboratory analyses, testing, and remote sensing; and the billed payroll time for travel and pre and post inspection preparation. This estimate does not require detailed documentation.

**Column 70: Facility Evaluation Rating.** Use information gathered during the inspection (regardless of inspection type) to evaluate the quality of the facility self-monitoring program. Grade the program using a scale of 1 to 5 with a score of 5 being used for very reliable self-monitoring programs, 3 being satisfactory, and 1 being used for very unreliable programs.

**Column 71: Biomonitoring Information.** Enter D for static testing. Enter F for flow through testing. Enter N for no biomonitoring.

**Column 72: Quality Assurance Data Inspection.** Enter Q if the inspection was conducted as followup on quality assurance sample results. Enter N otherwise.

**Columns 73-80:** These columns are reserved for regionally defined information.

## Section B: Facility Data

This section is self-explanatory except for "Other Facility Data," which may include new information not in the permit or PCS (e.g., new outfalls, names of receiving waters, new ownership, other updates to the record, SIC/NAICS Codes, Latitude/Longitude).

## Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection

Check only those areas evaluated by marking the appropriate box. Use Section D and additional sheets as necessary. Support the findings, as necessary, in a brief narrative report. Use the headings given on the report form (e.g., Permit, Records/Reports) when discussing the areas evaluated during the inspection.

## Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

Briefly summarize the inspection findings. This summary should abstract the pertinent inspection findings, not replace the narrative report. Reference a list of attachments, such as completed checklists taken from the NPDES Compliance Inspection Manuals and pretreatment guidance documents, including effluent data when sampling has been done. Use extra sheets as necessary.

\*Footnote: In addition to the inspection types listed above under column 18, a state may continue to use the following wet weather and CAFO inspection types until the state is brought into ICIS-NPDES: K: CAFO, V: SSO, Y: CSO, W: Storm Water 9: MS4. States may also use the new wet weather, CAFO and MS4 inspections types shown in column 18 of this form. The EPA regions are required to use the new wet weather, CAFO, and MS4 inspection types for inspections with an inspection date (DTIN) on or after July 1, 2005.

**NPDES  
Inspection Report**

**Jerome Cheese Company**

**Jerome, Idaho**

**ID-002760-0**

**April 2, 2009**

**Prepared by:  
Joe Roberto, Environmental Engineer  
Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10  
Office of Compliance and Enforcement  
Inspection and Enforcement Management Unit**



## **Table of Contents**

- I. Facility Information
- II. Inspection Information
- III. Owner and Operator Information
- IV. Inspection Entry
- V. Scope of Inspection
- VI. Background
- VII. Discharge Waste Streams
- VIII. Self Monitoring Effluent Sample Collection
- IX. Phosphorous Treatment
- X. Areas of Concern
  - A. Fecal Coliform Bacteria Holding Time
  - B. Phosphorous Discharge Levels
  - C. Phosphorous Progress Reports
  - D. Annual Water Quality Monitoring Summary
  - E. Daily Maximum Effluent Limit Violation 24-Hour Reporting
  - F. Daily Maximum Effluent Limit Violation Five Day Written Notice Requirement
  - G. Ambient Monitoring Quality Assurance Plan Availability
  - H. Dissolved Oxygen Holding Time
- XI. Closing Conference

## **Attachments**

- A. Photograph Documentation
- B. Facility Aerial View Showing Photograph Documentation Location and Direction
- C. Table 6 From Quality Assurance Plan
- D. Dissolved Oxygen Laboratory Data Sheets



(Unless otherwise noted, all details in this inspection report were obtained from conversations William (Bill) Riebesell or Dave Moore or from observations during the inspection.)

## **I. Facility Information**

Facility Name: Jerome Cheese Company

Facility Contact(s): Bill Riebesell, Plant Manager  
Dave Moore, Production Supervisor

Facility Type: Cheese Manufacturing and Whey Drying (SIC 2022)

Facility/Mailing Address: 47 West 100 South  
Jerome, Idaho 83338

Phone #s: (208) 324-8806 (Office)  
(208) 324-8892 (Fax)  
(208) 731-3565 (Cell)

NPDES Permit Number: ID-002760-0

Receiving Water: Lateral 12

## **II. Inspection Information**

Inspection Date: April 2, 2009

Inspectors: Joe Roberto (EPA) and Dustan Bott (EPA)

Weather Condition: Rain

Arrival Time: 8:50 AM

Departure Time: 1:30 PM

Purpose: Determination of compliance with their NPDES Permit

## **III. Owner and Operator Information**

This facility is owned and operated by Davisco Foods International, Inc., doing business as Jerome Cheese Company.

## **IV. Inspection Entry**

This was an unannounced inspection. I presented my credentials to Bill Riebesell upon

arriving at the facility. I was accompanied throughout the inspection by Bill Riebesell and Dave Moore.

I was not denied access to the facility. I was allowed to inspect all areas that I wished to inspect.

## **V. Scope of Inspection**

The purpose of this inspection was to determine compliance with the NPDES permit issued to Jerome Cheese Company. This compliance inspection consisted of an opening conference to conduct initial introductions and to discuss the purpose and expectations of the inspection; facility tour to inspect wastewater related components and activities; a file review; and closing conference to discuss compliance related concerns.

This inspection also included a visit to the office of Magic Valley Labs in Twin Falls, Idaho to obtain information regarding sample collection and analyses for Jerome Cheese Company.

## **VI. Background**

The Jerome Cheese Company is a cheese manufacturing and whey drying facility located in Jerome, Idaho. This facility operates 24-hours per day, 7-days per week and currently employs 286 people.

This facility processes approximately 5.6 million pounds of milk per day and produces 200 million pounds of cheese and whey per year.

On average, this facility sends 750,000 gallons per day of wastewater to the City of Jerome wastewater treatment facility for treatment. According to Bill Riebesell, they are allowed to send up to 950,000 gallons per day to the city system.

In addition to the above, this facility also discharges approximately 650,000 gallons of wastewater per day to the receiving water known as Lateral 12.

See the photograph documentation and facility aerial view which are included in this report as attachments A and B, respectively, for details of facility components.

## **VII. Discharge Waste Streams**

The bulk of the waste generated at this facility is the result of the evaporation (and condensation) of liquid from the milk processed at the facility. In general, a portion of

this evaporated liquid is reused at the facility for wash water. This portion of the waste stream is ultimately routed to the City of Jerome wastewater treatment plant for treatment.

The remainder of the evaporated liquid is ultimately discharged to Lateral 12. It is this waste stream that is regulated by the NPDES permit.

### **VIII. Self Monitoring Effluent Sample Collection**

As mentioned above, the wastewater discharged into Lateral 12 is essentially liquid that has been evaporated (and condensed) from the processed milk. This liquid is then routed through a series of pipes and temporarily stored in one of four holding tanks. The liquid in these holding tanks can then be rerouted into the facility and used as wash water or it can be discharged into Lateral 12. See photograph #2 of attachment A for details.

The portion of the waste discharged into Lateral 12 is a mixture of flows from each of the holding tanks. Flows from each holding tank are combined into a single pipeline prior to exiting the facility building. See photograph #s 3 and 4 of attachment A for details.

At the time of the inspection, I asked Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore where the effluent sample was collected. Mr. Moore explained that the dissolved oxygen sample was collected from a pipeline in the manhole located along the northern edge of the property. This collection point is from the pipeline that exits the Jerome Cheese Company building, just prior to discharging into Lateral 12. See photograph #4 of attachment A for a view of this sample collection location.

The other effluent parameters are analyzed from a sample collected directly from the four holding tanks situated in the Jerome Cheese Company building. According to Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore an equal amount of sample is collected from each holding tank and composited. This composited sample is analyzed for all effluent parameters except dissolved oxygen. Mr. Riebesell said that this composite sample is representative of what is being discharged into Lateral 12.

I then asked why the dissolved oxygen sample was collected at a different location than the other effluent parameters. Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore said that they did not know.

### **IX. Phosphorous Treatment**

One of the challenges at the Jerome Cheese Company is controlling the amount of phosphorous being discharged through its outfall. The effective NPDES permit issued to this facility specifies a schedule in which Jerome Cheese Company must achieve compliance with its phosphorous limitation.



At the time of the inspection, I asked Mr. Riebesell about the attempts that have been made by Jerome Cheese Company to achieve compliance with the phosphorous limit. Mr. Riebesell indicated that one of the earlier options to deal with phosphorous was to build a wastewater treatment plant that would handle all the wastewater generated at the facility. This includes all the waste currently being discharged into Lateral 12 as well as all the waste currently being discharged to the City of Jerome. Mr. Riebesell said that the projected cost of this proposed treatment plant is \$21,029,303 and the maintenance cost for such a plant would be \$589,000 per year.

According to Mr. Riebesell, Jerome Cheese Company is now pursuing another option to deal with the phosphorous limit. They plan on entering into a pollutant trading program with the City of Jerome to utilize some of the city's unused phosphorous credits. This option would still involve some construction, however. Mr. Riebesell said that in order to qualify to exchange credits, Jerome Cheese Company must discharge either at the same location as the city discharge or just down stream of the city discharge. This would require the installation of approximately two and a half miles of pipeline.

On May 13, 2009, I contacted Mr. Riebesell to ask additional questions. I asked Mr. Riebesell how much it would cost to install the approximately two and a half miles of pipeline mentioned above. He said that it was unclear at this point how much the pipeline would cost since Jerome Cheese Company was currently in discussions with City of Jerome representatives to identify who would be responsible for paying for the pipeline. Mr. Riebesell said that the City of Jerome may pay for the entire installation.

I then said to Mr. Riebesell that I must be missing something since it appears that the City of Jerome is giving up phosphorous credits and yet they are also apparently willing to pay for the two and a half mile extension of the Jerome Cheese Company outfall. I then asked what the incentive was for the city to do all this. Mr. Riebesell's response was that in exchange for the pollution credits the Jerome Cheese Company would agree to have the Jerome Cheese Company property annexed into the City of Jerome. Being annexed by the city will result in approximately \$325,000 of annual tax revenue paid to the City of Jerome.

In addition, Mr. Riebesell said that if Jerome Cheese Company went with the earlier option of constructing a treatment plant, the City of Jerome would end up losing approximately \$85,000 per month of current revenue. This \$85,000 monthly revenue loss is the amount that Jerome Cheese Company currently pays the city for treating the waste that is currently discharged into the city system. This amount would be lost because the proposed treatment plant is designed to treat all the waste generated by Jerome Cheese Company.



## **X. Areas of Concern**

I inspected the facility including the waste handling system and the discharge location. I identified several areas of concern during this inspection. These areas of concern are identified as follows:

### **A. Fecal Coliform Bacteria Holding Time**

Part I.A.1. of the NPDES permit specifies that the effluent from Jerome Cheese Company shall be monitored weekly for fecal coliform bacteria and part III.C. of the permit states that "monitoring must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 CFR 136....."

In addition to the above, Table II of Title 40, Part 136 of the Code of Federal Regulations states that fecal coliform samples must be analyzed within 6 hours of sample collection.

At the time of the inspection, I reviewed the facility quality assurance plan (QAP). This QAP specifies that the holding time for fecal coliform bacteria is 48 hours. See attachment C of this report for a copy of Table 6 from the QAP which specifies the fecal coliform holding time.

I communicated this concern to Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore at the time of the inspection closing conference.

Although the facility's QAP specifies a 48-hour holding time, the laboratory conducting the analysis (Magic Valley Labs) actually initiates the processing of the samples well within six hours of sample collection.

### **B. Phosphorous Discharge Levels**

Part I.A.1. of the NPDES permit specifies that the effluent must achieve a total phosphorous level of 0 mg/l. Part I.D.1. of the permit also states that the permittee must achieve compliance with the phosphorous limitations by September 1, 2006.

Available discharge monitoring reports suggest that the phosphorous limitations were not achieved by the September 1, 2006 compliance date. In addition, these limitations were not achieved by the time of this inspection. According to Bill Riebesell, the facility is still working on trying to achieve these limitations.

I communicated this concern to Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore at the time of the inspection closing conference.

C. Phosphorous Progress Reports

Table 5 of part I.D.3. of the NPDES permit establishes the schedule of compliance that Jerome Cheese Company must meet to achieve its phosphorous effluent limitations. This table also establishes the interim tasks to be conducted to achieve this limitation, the deliverables required to be submitted to EPA, and the deliverable due dates.

At the time of the inspection, I asked whether any of these tasks required in the permit were ever conducted. The response I received was that they were not sure whether any response was provided to EPA.

I communicated this concern to Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore at the time of the inspection closing conference.

Subsequent to the inspection, I contacted Bill Riebesell by phone (on May 6, 2009) to ask again whether any of these compliance schedule deliverables were submitted to EPA. Mr. Riebesell's response was that he would check, however, he thought that the only response provided to EPA was the response provided in the monthly discharge monitoring reports.

D. Annual Water Quality Monitoring Summary

Part I.B. of the NPDES permit establishes the ambient monitoring requirements. These requirements include the submittal of an Annual Water Quality Monitoring Summary report which analyzes the ambient monitoring results for the year. This Annual Water Quality Monitoring Summary must be submitted with the January DMR for the next year.

At the time of the inspection, I asked for the latest Annual Water Quality Monitoring Summary. The latest summary at the facility was for the year 2006. Bill Riebesell and Dave Moore said that the summaries for 2007 and 2008 were not prepared.

I communicated this concern to Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore at the time of the inspection closing conference.

E. Daily Maximum Effluent Limit Violation 24-Hour Reporting

Part III.G.1.d. of the NPDES permit states that the permittee must report to EPA any violation of a maximum daily discharge limitation for any of the pollutants in Table 1 of part I.A. of the permit within 24 hours of becoming aware of the violation.

According to discharge monitoring reports submitted by the facility, the Jerome Cheese Company has exceeded the daily maximum phosphorous limitation. At the time of the inspection, I asked Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore if they ever reported these daily maximum violations to EPA by phone within 24-hours. They said no.

I communicated this concern to Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore at the time of the inspection closing conference.

F. Daily Maximum Effluent Limit Violation Five Day Written Notice Reporting

Part III.G.2. of the NPDES permit states that the permittee must provide written submission within five days of the time that the permittee becomes aware of a daily maximum effluent limit violation for any of the pollutants in Table 1 of part I.A. of the permit.

According to discharge monitoring reports submitted by the facility, the Jerome Cheese Company has exceeded the daily maximum phosphorous limitation. At the time of the inspection, I asked Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore if they ever reported these daily maximum violations to EPA in writing within five days. They said no.

I communicated this concern to Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore at the time of the inspection closing conference.

G. Ambient Monitoring Quality Assurance Plan Availability

Part I.C. of the NPDES permit specifies that the permittee must develop a quality assurance plan for all monitoring required by this permit. In addition, part I.C.5. of the permit specifies that copies of the quality assurance plan must be kept onsite and made available to IDEQ and EPA or an authorized representative upon request.

At the time of the inspection, I asked to see a copy of the quality assurance plan for samples collected at the facility. As a result, I was provided with a QAP for the samples collected of the effluent discharge. I was not provided with a copy of the QAP for the ambient monitoring samples required by the permit. Instead, Bill Riebesell indicated that representatives of Magic Valley Labs would be able to answer questions about the ambient monitoring since this contract laboratory is collecting these samples for the facility.

Note that although the QAP for ambient monitoring was not available at the facility, it was available at the office of Magic Valley Labs.



Also note that at the time of the inspection, I asked Bill Riebesell and Dave Moore to identify exactly where the ambient monitoring samples were collected. They could not identify exactly where the samples were collected and instead suggested that representatives of Magic Valley Labs would be better able to provide this information.

I communicated this concern to Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore at the time of the inspection closing conference.

H. Dissolved Oxygen Holding Time

Part I.A.1. of the NPDES permit specifies that the effluent from Jerome Cheese Company shall be monitored weekly for dissolved oxygen. Part III.C. of the permit states that "monitoring must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 CFR 136....."

In addition to the above, Table II of Title 40, Part 136 of the Code of Federal Regulations states that dissolved oxygen must be analyzed immediately after sample collection. This part of the Code of Federal Regulations further states that the term "analyze immediately" usually means within fifteen minutes or less of sample collection.

At the time of the inspection, Mr. Moore said that dissolved oxygen samples were analyzed by Magic Valley Labs in Twin Falls, Idaho. He also said that samples are delivered to Magic Valley Labs within an hour of sample collection. In addition, sample analysis work sheets obtained from Magic Valley Labs indicate, for specific samples, the sample collection times and the arrival times at the lab. All of this information suggests that the dissolved oxygen sample holding time may not be achieved.

See attachment D of this report for examples of these dissolved oxygen analyses work sheets.

I communicated this concern to Mr. Riebesell and Mr. Moore at the time of the inspection closing conference.

## **XI. Closing Conference**

The closing conference was held with Bill Riebesell and Dave Moore. As indicated above, I identified and discussed the areas of concerns at the time of the closing conference.

**Report Completion Date:**

May 14, 2009

**Lead Inspector Signature:**

John A. Kibb

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **Photograph Documentation Jerome Cheese Company**

**All photographs were taken by Dustan Bott on the day of the inspection.**





**Photo #1:** This is a picture of the plant looking southeast from the north edge of the property. EPA inspector Joe Roberto is shown in the foreground.



**Photo #2:** This is a picture of the area in the plant where the separated condensate water is routed through pipelines and stored in containment tanks. These tanks are situated on the other side of the wall on the right side of this photograph. Water from these tanks is either used for wash water or discharged to Lateral 12. Effluent discharge water samples are composited from these tanks.



**Photo #3:** This picture shows four condensate water pipes combining into one larger pipe inside the plant. The yellow arrow indicates the entry point for all the water discharged to Later 12.



**Photo #4:** This is a picture looking into a manhole near the north border of the Plant property. The pipe inside the manhole is where all the water from the Plant enters Lateral 12. The effluent sample for dissolved oxygen is collected in this manhole.



**Photo #5:** This is a picture looking southwest at where Lateral 12 first daylights. The yellow arrow shows the direction of flow.



**Photo #6:** This is a close up of the flume in Lateral 12 looking upstream. This picture was taken on the west side of the property looking northwest.





**Photo #7:** This is a close up of the water and substrate in Lateral 12 as it flows along the west side of the Plant property.



**Photo #8:** This is a picture looking west at where Lateral 12 leaves the facility from the west side of the property.



**Photo #9:** This is looking into a manhole at the water from the plant being sent to the City of Jerome wastewater treatment facility. This manhole is located on the north border of the Plant property.

# **ATTACHMENT B**

**Facility Aerial View  
Showing Photograph Documentation Location and Direction**

**Jerome Cheese Company**



Facility Aerial View Showing Photograph Location and Direction



# **ATTACHMENT C**

**Table 6 from Quality Assurance Plan**

**Jerome Cheese Company**

### Sampling Methods Requirements

A summary of the protocols for sample preservation, volumes, container types, and holding times are listed in Table 6.

Table 6: Sample Methods Requirements Summary

Parameter	Method	Method Detection Limit (mg/L)	Preservation	Volume and Container	Holding Time
BOD	SM 5210 B	1	COOL 4 C	500ML HDPE	48 HRS
TSS	EPA 160.2	1	COOL 4 C	500ML HDPE	7 DAYS
FECAL COLIFORM	SM 9222 D	1	COOL 4 C NA THIO	100ML HDPE	48 HRS
PH*	EPA 150.1	0.1	NONE RQD	Monitoring Probe	ANALYZE IMMEDIATE.
TEMP*	EPA 170.1	0.1	NONE RQD	Monitoring Probe	ANALYZE IMMEDIATE.
DO	EPA 360.1	0.1	NONE RQD	500ML BOD BOTTLE	ANALYZE IMMEDIATE.
AMMONIA/N	EPA 350.3	0.05	COOL 4 C H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> TO <2	500ML HDPE	28 DAYS
TOTAL P	EPA 365.2	0.001	COOL 4 C H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> TO <2	500ML HDPE	28 DAYS
NITRATE/N	EPA 353.2	0.06	COOL 4 C	500ML HDPE	48 HRS
NITRITE/N	EPA 353.2	0.003	COOL 4 C	500ML HDPE	48 HRS
TKN	EPA 351.2	0.05	COOL 4 C H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> TO <2	500ML HDPE	28 DAYS
ORTHO P	EPA 365.2	0.001	COOL 4 C	500ML HDPE	48 HRS

\* pH and Temperature are data-logged using calibrated instrumentation appropriate to the sample.

Update May 2006



# **ATTACHMENT D**

**Dissolved Oxygen Laboratory Data Sheets**

**Jerome Cheese Company**

**MAGIC VALLEY LABS**

210 Addison Ave / PO Box 1867

Twin Falls ID 83303-1867

Phone: (208) 733-4250

Fax: (208) 734-2539

**DAVID MOORE  
JEROME CHEESE**

**47 W 100 S  
JEROME ID 83338**

**Collection Date** 2/10/2009 **Received Date** 2/10/2009 **Location**

**Collection Time** 11:50 AM **Received Time** 12:59 PM **CANAL**

<b>Sample #</b>	<b>Test / Method Code</b>	<b>Results in mg/L</b>	<b>Date Analyzed</b>	<b>Analyst</b>
897581	DISS. OXYGEN SM45000G	6.49	2/10/2009	MW

**Signature**



**Report Date:** Monday, February 23, 2009